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1 Background

In order to empower local people to manage and control natural resources and to contribute to both poverty reduction and resource protection, the Namibian Government is following two main strategies:

1. The establishment and management of community forests with a focus on the management of natural vegetation and related income opportunities (timber and non-timber forest product marketing, tourism, arts and crafts)
2. The establishment and management of conservancies with a focus on game and wildlife resources and related income opportunities (trophy hunting, tourism, camp sites, arts and crafts)

While both strategies share the common objectives to safeguard valuable natural resources and to enhance local peoples’ livelihoods, they are as yet implemented side by side, often in adjacent areas. Based on different policies and laws and the unique nature of targeted resources, both strategies also have different requirements for area sizes, area zonation, resource assessments, management planning, resource monitoring and the composition and constitution of management bodies.

Both strategies are also confronted with different levels of financial returns and modes of revenue administration.

Many conservancies are well advanced especially concerning capacity building, fund administration, organizational development and impact monitoring, whereas for community forests such procedures are still being developed, need to be further specified and tested.

While most conservancies are already gazetted and have gained their legal recognition, the gazetting of the first community forest is still pending. As a result, many communities already profit from or are well aware of the rights and benefits conservancies have to offer, whereas for community forests they still have to wait for the legal proclamation (gazetting) of areas. This is likely to happen during the course of 2004.

Forests and other types of natural vegetation constitute an integral part of ecosystems, habitats and landscapes. Therefore, their condition and development will not only determine income potential of community forestry and sustain traditional land utilization but their condition will as well determine living conditions for game and wildlife and thus future income potentials of conservancies.

Consequently, and in order to achieve a more comprehensive, transparent and effective CBNRM strategy, there is an urgent need to integrate both approaches.
2 Resources

2.1 Which resources/products are managed by which organization?
To avoid confusion in regard of resource management, following table should be used during working group discussions in order to clarify which organization should manage which resources or where joint management is appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Management Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Forest Resources</td>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicinal plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland</td>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Area set-up
The area set-up of already existing conservancies and neighbouring community forests has to be settled by the members of the respective committees and the communities. Therefore, a range of area set-ups can emerge in Caprivi. However, when envisaging a suitable area set-up, one should not only consider the situation of today but have a vision on how Caprivi could develop in future. As new conservancies and community forests are emerging, new – and more compatible - area set-ups may evolve.
Following options come about:

The first option considers separating conservancies from community forests and letting management bodies of both area categories handle all resources within their respective areas (see figure 1).
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Figure 1: Community forests and conservancy act separately within their areas

The second option suggests considering one conservancy area as one large community forest, so that both area categories share the same boundaries and a fixed set of management regulations and by-laws. This is the case in Kwando.
The third option arises where parts of a conservancy and a community forest overlap (see figure 3). For example, this is the case in Lubuta community forest and Mashi conservancy.

Each community forest unit would be controlled by a FMB on sub-Khuta level. In this case, the parties would have to negotiate on joint (integrated) management agreements for overlapping areas. Gaps in forest management in this set-up should be filled by DoF as long as community forestry is not in place.

An alternative of the third option is the case where conservancy and community forests share the same boundaries (see figure 4). This option, however, can only be achieved in cases where both, community forest and conservancy have not been gazetted yet. At the moment, this is the case in Masida and Lusele.

The forth option suggests an incorporation of community forestry into a conservancy. In this case, the FMB would act as a sub-division or working group of the conservancy committee. This might be advisable where the community forest lies inside a
conservancy and covers only a very small part thereof. In case a conservancy lies within a community forest, it could work the other way round as well.

Figure 5: Conservancy with forest working group

3 Organization
As for the area set-up, the organizational set-up in areas where conservancy and community forest boundaries are already decided upon, case-to-case solutions suited to the respective area set-up have to be found during the workshop.

Beside the option that conservancy committee and FMB work on their own without collaboration, a range of options exists.

In case, community forest and conservancy share the same boundary (referring to figure 2 and 4 in the area set-up), two possibilities arise. As for the first one, one committee is established which manages all resources. This committee might be divided into working groups with different expertise. The second possibility is the establishment of a Conservancy Management Board (CMB) and a Communal Forest Board (CFB) managing resources and products assigned as their duty. Both boards act at the same level while the CFB is split up into sub-committees according to sub-Khuta levels (see figure 6). The advantages of these sub-committees are the closer relation to the grass-root level and a certain security that decisions are made bottom-up. CMB and CFB might meet quarterly and report regularly to the chief.

Figure 6: Organizational set-up, Conservancy Management Board (CMB) and Communal Forest Board (CFB) with Forest Management Boards (FMB)
In case of overlapping boundaries (see figure 3 in area set-up), FMBs and CMB would go into negotiations on how to manage overlapping areas. Although no common organisational set-up could be established.

In case of option four, the FMB could be incorporated into the CMB as a working group. Option five would work the other way round.

More organizational issues have to be discussed as soon as a first step towards collaboration between conservancies and community forestry is made. These issues include conflict resolution, bylaws/law enforcement and distribution of revenues.

4 Support
Both, conservancies and community forestry have considerable resources such as funds, skilled staff and tools. It is advisable to complement and support each other within various areas. The following gives some suggestions where collaboration in support is possible.

- Extension services (e.g. mobilization of communities or inventories)
- Technical support (e.g. GIS, tools/other equipment, logistics, integrated land use planning)
- Training (e.g. joint organisation of courses, joint payment of external trainers)
- Involvement of other stakeholders (e.g. strengthening of CBNRM working group)
- Research (e.g. within area of fire or range management)
- Steering of project support (e.g. common office if conservancy and community forest share same boundary in order to reduce costs)